

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X
DR. RUTH C. MAY AND DR. DONNA E.
LEDGERWOOD, JUSTIN REED, MARK HOWARTH
and JEFFREY KNAPP, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated

Plaintiffs,

23 CIVIL 2583 (LJL)

-against-

JUDGMENT

BARCLAYS PLC AND BARCLAYS BANK PLC, JAMES
E. STALEY, TUSHAR MORZARIA, STEVEN EWART,
C.S. VENKATAKRISHNAN, TIM THROSBY, ANNA
CROSS, NIGEL HIGGINS, ALEX THURSBY, HELEN
KEELAN, HELENE VAN DORT, JEREMY SCOTT,
MARIA RICHTER,
and DOES 1-12,

Defendants.

-----X
It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:** That for the reasons
stated in the Court's Opinion and Order dated March 21, 2025, Defendants' motion to dismiss is
GRANTED. "Although Rule 15(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that leave to
amend 'shall be freely given when justice so requires,' it is within the sound discretion of the
district court to grant or deny leave to amend." *McCarthy v. Dun & Bradstreet Corp.*, 482 F.3d
184, 200 (2d Cir. 2007) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)). "A district court has discretion to deny
leave for good reason, including futility, bad faith, undue delay, or undue prejudice to the
opposing party." *Id.* Plaintiffs have not "proffered the content of any proposed amendment or
given any clue as to how the complaints defects would be cured." *In re Skechers USA, Inc. Sec.*
Litig., 444 F. Supp. 3d 498, 530 n.19 (S.D.N.Y. 2020) (citation omitted). Plaintiffs' failure to
state a claim to relief does not appear to be the product of inartful pleading but rather substantive

issues with Plaintiff's claims that would make repleading futile. See *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000). The amended complaint is therefore dismissed with prejudice.

Accordingly, the case is closed.

Dated: New York, New York

March 21, 2025

TAMMI M. HELLWIG

Clerk of Court

BY:



Deputy Clerk